Response

The claims were amended in accordance with the amendments above. The amendments to the claims are being made to clarify the invention and to focus the claims on those aspects of the invention which are a commercial priority to the Applicant. All of the amendments are fully supported by the specification, claims, and figures as originally filed. No new matter is believed or intended to be involved.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview during the interview that the present amendment to independent claim 1, which of office incorporates the subject mater of now-canceled claim 2 with the Examiner on 08/02/2005. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication art of record. Applicant acknowledges that the Examiner reserved the right to supplement his search.

> In the Office Action dated 06/02/2005, Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Freeman (US 2,659,544). Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bradshaw (US 2,842,322). Under MPEP 2131, a claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102 only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. In addition, the elements in the prior art reference must be arranged as required by the claim. MPEP 2131 (emphasis added).

> In addition, Applicant notes that under MPEP 2143.03, in order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the prior art reference or combination of references must teach or suggest all of the limitations of a claim. A prima facie case of obviousness also requires that there be some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to modify the references either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. MPEP 2143.01. The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. MPEP 2143.01.